

4

DTIC FILE COPY

DPSYCH-N

R/N 2/90

AR-005-841

AD-A224 816

DTIC
ECTE
JUL 31 1990
S D D

The Royal Australian Navy
Officer Retention Study

The Effects of Age, Educational Level and Branch
Membership upon the Attitudes of Young, Male, RAN Officers

Part 2
Between Branches

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

by

R.G. SALAS

Area Psychologist

Melbourne

C Commonwealth of Australia
April 1990

APPROVED
FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

90 07 30 180

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA

Page Classification

1a. A R Number 005-841	1b. Establishment Number R.Note 2/90	2. Document Date April 1990	3. Task Number
4. Title The effect of Age, Educational level and Branch Membership upon Attitudes of male, RAN officers. Part 2. Between Branches.		5. Security Classification (Place appropriate classification in box/s ie Secret(S), Confidential(C), Restricted (R), Unclassified (U))	6. No. Pages
5. Author(s) R.G. Salas Area Psychologist (Navy) Box XYZ GPO Melbourne Vic 3001		<input type="checkbox"/> document <input type="checkbox"/> title <input type="checkbox"/> abstract	7. No. Refs 18
6. Corporate Author and Address DPSYCH-NAVY Russell Offices Canberra ACT 2600 Australia		9. Downgrading, Deletion Instructions	
11. Office/Position responsible for Sponsor DPSYCH-N Security DPSYCH-N Downgrading Approval			
12. Secondary Distribution (Of this document) Approved for public release.			
Overseas enquiries outside stated limitations should be referred through Defence Information Services Department of Defence. CANBERRA ACT 2601			
13a. This document may be announced in catalogues and awareness services available to: Unlimited			
13b. Citation for other purposes (ie. casual announcements) may be <input type="checkbox"/> unrestricted or <input type="checkbox"/> or for 13a			
14. Descriptors Personnel Officer Retention; Surveys; General officer; Age, Educational; Branch effect; Naval Personnel; Officer attitudes (inclination); Australia. (CP) Institutional occupational model Royal Australian Navy		15. COSATI Group	
16. Abstract The attitudes of Young (< 30 Years) tertiary educated officers from each of three RAN branches were compared to those held by their counterparts in the Executive branch. Engineering officers, Instructors and Supply officers, in that order, held more negative attitudes towards the Service than did Executive branch members. This result was interpreted within the rationale of the institutional-occupational (I/O) hypothesis and the general utility of the I/O construct was examined. Keywords:			

148

This page is to be used to record information which is required by the Establishment for its own use but which will not be added to the DISTIS data unless specifically requested.

16 Abstract (Contd)

17 Import

18 Document Series and Number

19 Cost Code

20 Type of Report and Period Covered

21 Computer Programs Used

22 Establishment File Ref(s)

23 Additional Information (As required)

ABSTRACT

The attitudes of young (< 30 Years) tertiary educated officers from each of three RAN branches were compared to those held by their counterparts in the Executive branch.

Engineering officers, Instructors and Supply officers, in that order, held more negative attitudes towards the Service than did Executive branch members.

This result was interpreted within the rationale of the institutional-occupational (I/O) hypothesis and the general utility of the I/O construct was examined.



Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	2
Aim	5
Procedure	5
Results	6
Comparison 1	6
Comparison 2	13
Comparison 3	15
Summary and Comment	16
The Utility of the I/O Hypothesis	20
Heuristic Possibilities	21
Technical Note 1	24
Technical Note 2	25
Technical Note 3	27
Technical Note 4	28
References	29
Annex A. Retention Survey Questionnaire	
Annex B. Description of the Scales	

INTRODUCTION

In a previous publication (Salas, 1990) an attempt to compare attitudes to the Navy within each of four branches was reported. The attitudes of male officers possessed of tertiary level education were compared with those of their age peers who did not possess a tertiary level of education.

The attempt was successful in the case of the Executive and the Supply branches only. Not enough Engineering branch officers without degrees were available in one age grouping (≤ 30 years) and in the case of the Instructors all branch members must possess degrees.

It was concluded from the results available that young (≤ 30 years) tertiary educated members of the Supply branch were relatively more negative and volatile in their attitudes than were their age peers in the same branch who did not possess a tertiary level education. This conclusion corresponded to observations reported earlier by the RAN Regular Officer Careers Study Team (Salas, *ibid*).

These observations included a conjecture that similarly negative and volatile attitudes towards the Navy might gradually become characteristic of membership of the Executive branch as more and more officers belonging to that branch acquired officially encouraged tertiary educational qualifications.

However, no evidence to support this conjecture appeared in the results of the study alluded to above (Salas, *ibid*) i.e. Attitudes of the tertiary and the secondary educational groups within the Executive branch were largely undifferentiated across a wide variety of topics. This held for both young and older age groupings. Overall, the results discussed above appeared to confirm those presented in a previous report (Salas, 1989) which analysed officer attitudes by branch and career stage. i.e. members of those branches which featured the possession of tertiary educational qualifications as an entry requirement (Engineers, Instructors) appeared to exhibit different attitude patterns than did members of those branches which did not require a degree as an entry requirement (Executive and Supply).

In an attempt to explain these two sets of results the present writer speculated that attitudes of degree holding officers might be moderated by the type of degree possessed. To those officers holding degrees of relatively higher marketability in society (engineering, teaching commerce/accounting) was ascribed a more calculating, rational, unsentimental mind-set making it more likely for them to perceive the Service in more critical, less emotional, more objective fashion than those officers possessed of qualifications of lesser marketability such as the Arts or Science degrees traditionally arrived at by career members of the Executive branch. These latter, more general, tertiary educational credentials are not keyed to any particular civilian reference group, being broadly perceived as a desirable professional enhancement of claims to a successful Naval career rather than a potential meal ticket for eventual use in civilian life. In general Executive branch officers appear comparatively more committed to a Naval career and have a more positive attitude towards Navy management than do members of other branches, particularly Engineers. (Salas, 1989)

These two, more or less distinct patterns of attitudes towards the organization discussed above were perceived to be not dissimilar to those described by sociologists* as "institutional" on one hand and "occupational" on the other, as follows.

Members of the Engineering, Instructor and Supply branches would be classed as possessing an "occupational" orientation towards the Service, viz

"They would tend to have civilian life as their main reference group. Their self-image is likely to be based more on the social and economic standards of this reference group. They are likely to place their personal goals before the aims and welfare of the Service. They would tend to query Service values and functioning from a more detached, rational, less emotional viewpoint in appraising their career prospects" (Salas, *ibid*).

In comparison the orientation of members of the Executive branch are likely to be characterized as being "institutional". Attitudes of officers with such a self-image, by definition are based on a belief in the values and

goals of the organization and involve feelings of duty and obligation. Such officers tend to accept hardship and disappointments without losing faith, have a tendency to place the welfare and aims of the Service before their own and repudiate other memberships.

A fundamental ("overarching")* component of the hypothesis is the necessity for the more sentimental institutional attitudes to gradually be replaced by or transformed into, more rational occupational attitudes supposedly occurring in response to the onmarch of technology and the civilianization of the military.

Convincing examples of this inevitable transformation have yet to be demonstrated either in military or civilian work organizations. It appears that the establishment of a satisfactory historical baseline where an initial high-watermark of institutional military commitment existed, perhaps accompanied at the same time by a low level of occupational orientation has yet to occur so as to allow acceptable measurements to take place. No provision seems to be allowed for an occupational orientation becoming transformed into an institutional one.

Some sociologists suggest that the good old days when the military was allegedly motivated almost solely by a sacrificial patriotism, may not have existed, at least in peacetime, and that a healthy component of self-interest has always been involved in a member's relationships with the military as an employing organization. (Segal, 1986)

Some results of the current series of researches into the role of age, career stage, branch and educational level in the generation of differential RAN officer attitude patterns suggests that a highwater mark of institutionalized Service attitudes might be discerned in the posture of the membership of the Executive branch of the Royal Australian Navy. (Salas, 1989, 1990)

* Moskos (1986)

To confirm these results it is necessary to supplement the results of the earlier, only partially effective within-branch analysis of the effects upon attitudes of age and educational level (Salas, 1990) with the results of a between branch analysis using the same independent variables. This is the objective of the present study.

AIM

1. To test the following hypothesis

"Tertiary educated members of the Engineering, Instructor and Supply branches who are thirty years of age or less possess comparatively more volatile and negative attitudes towards the Navy than do their age and educational peers in the Executive branch."

2. To examine the utility of the "institutional" and "occupational" orientations as explanatory constructs in the present context.

PROCEDURE

Mean Retention Survey questionnaire item and Scale scores of young (≤ 30 years) tertiary educated officers from the Engineering, Instructor and Supply branches were compared in turn with those of their age and educational peers in the Executive branch.

The statistical significance of any mean score differences was established using t. To minimize Type 1 errors for the three comparisons involved a probability level of 0.002 was set. This reduced the likelihood of a chance result to less than one in one thousand.*

*The results of ANOVA by branch and Scales is reported in Technical Note

RESULTS

Officers < 30 years of age with degrees.

Comparison 1

Executive Branch v Engineering Branch

(n = 154)

(n = 66)

Section 1 of the Retention Survey questionnaire*

No statistically significant mean item score differences appeared.

Section 2

Item 1 Officers have expressed the observation that there are comparatively few billets at future rank levels which have much interest in them. This implies posting an officer to positions of which he/she is not a volunteer. How does, or will, this situation apply to you?

Very much 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

Branch	Mean	t	p
Executive	3.4		
Engineer	4.5	-4.01	.000

This prospect applies significantly to more Engineers than Executives. It is unlikely to be construed as a positive.

* Annex A

Item 9 How satisfied are you with the quality of the RAN Personnel Management (including Officer Career Planning)?

Satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Most unsatisfied

Branch	Mean	t	p
Executive	3.5		
Engineer	2.7	3.51	.001

Engineers tend to be significantly less satisfied with the DNOP* function than Executive. The level of satisfaction in both of these branches is very low on this topic.

Section 3

Item 8 At present how certain do you feel that you could get satisfactory employment in civilian life without much trouble?#

Very certain 4
 Fairly certain 3
 Uncertain 2
 Not Applicable 1

Branch	Mean	t	p
Engineer	3.6		
Executive	3.0	5.85	.000

Engineers appear to feel more sanguine about their civilian employment aspects. This result could reflect the "meal ticket" aspect of certain degrees. The size of the t value indicates that this is a very clear cut result, statistically speaking.

* Director of Naval Officer Planning

This item also forms the Job Estimation Scale (JOBEST)

Section 4

Item 1 How well do you think the Navy is run?

Very well 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very badly

Branch	Mean	t	p
Executive	3.8		
Engineer	3.0	4.02	.000

Neither branch appears to think that the Navy is an efficiently run organization but the members of the Engineering branch appear to be significantly more negative in their attitude than the members of the Executive branch.

Item 2 What sort of chance does the Navy give you to show what you can do?

Branch	Mean	t	p
Executive	4.5		
Engineer	3.7	3.6	.000

Engineers appear to be more critical than Executive branch officers on the matter of opportunities to show their skills and talents.

Item 12 How satisfied are you with your Navy career to date?

Branch	Mean	t	p
Executive	5.2		
Engineer	4.2	4.1	.000

Engineers were significantly more dissatisfied with their career development than were Executive officers.

Item 14 I find that my values and Navy values are very similar.

Branch	Mean	t	p
Executive	4.6		
Engineer	3.8	3.3	.001

Executive officers see significantly more congruence between their personal values and those of "the Navy" than do professional Engineers.

Section 5

Likely Reasons for Resignation*

Item 11 Non-use or misuse of your professional skills

Branch	Mean Scale Score	t	p
Executive	3.1		
Engineer	3.8	4.48	.000

This resignation influence applies significantly more to Engineers. It appears to reflect an "occupational" outlook and it appears to complement the sentiments of Item 2 of Section 4 ("show Navy what you can do").

Scale Score Differentials (see Annex B)

Scale of Commitment to the Service (CS)

Branch	Mean Scale Score	t	p
Executive	28.9		
Engineer	25.3	3.26	.002

* Five point scales

Engineers appear to be significantly less committed to the Service than Executive officers.

Career Prospects Scale (CPS)

Branch	Mean Scale Score	t	p
Executive	15.0	4.39	.000
Engineer	12.2		

Engineers perceive significantly lesser career prospects in the Navy than do Executive officers. This result is in line with the differing attitude orientations under discussion.

Job Satisfaction Scale (JOBSAT)

Branch	Mean Scale Score	t	p
Executive	26.4		
Engineers	22.9	3.66	.000

Engineers appear to be significantly less satisfied with their Navy jobs than are Executive officers. Reasons for this could be discerned in their responses to some of the items and Scales discussed above.

Service Effectiveness Scale (SE)

Branch	Mean Scale Score	t	p
Executive	23.9		
Engineer	20.7	3.56	.001

The professional Engineering officer tends to see the Navy as a relatively inefficient employer. Once again reasons for this may be inferred from a perusal of the items Scales processed above so far.

Emotional Commitment Scale (KS)

Branch	Mean Score	t	p
Executive	17.0		
Engineer	14.8	3.36	.001

This Scale is part of the general Commitment Scale (CS) which was dealt with earlier in this context. KS however aims to isolate the largely emotional commitment represented by congruency of values, feelings of obligation and the personal meaning of the Navy to the individual (see Annex B). Executive officers tend to be significantly more emotionally committed than Engineers. This is in line with the claimed institutional orientation of Executives and the occupational orientation of the Engineer.

Summary

Attitudes of young (30 years) professional Engineering branch members differ from those of their age peers with degrees in the Executive branch in the following ways

- a. They foresee more future obligatory postings of a less interesting nature in their future career.....
- b. they are less satisfied with Navy personnel management.....
- c. they feel that they are likely to be able to get civilian employment more easily.....
- d. they think that the Navy is more badly run
- e. they perceive less congruence between their values and those of the Navy
- f. they perceive lesser opportunities in the Navy for them to display their talents

- g. they see non-use or misuse of their professional skills as a greater possible influence on their resignation.....
- h. they are less generally committed to the Navy.....
- i. they see lesser career prospects in the Service
- j. they report lesser job satisfaction
- k. they regard the Navy as an inefficient employer more
- l. they are significantly less emotionally committed to the Navy
..... than young Executive branch officers possessing degrees.

CONCLUSIONS AND COMMENTS

The above results appear to support the contention raised previously (Salas, 1990) that young Engineers are likely to have an occupational orientation to Navy service. This is in contrast to Executive officers who were claimed to possess a more basic, institutional orientation.

Attitudes of this age group of professional engineers are comparable in volatility to those of young graduate Supply branch officers, evidence for which was previously brought to notice when their attitudes were compared with their branch counterparts who were educated to the secondary level only. Tertiary educated Supply branch officers were also then seen to possess an occupational rather than an institutional orientation towards Navy service. (ibid)

In regard to the present results there were no significant mean age, length of service, rank or marital status differentials evident between scores of the Engineer and Executive subsamples dealt with above.

Mean differences in length of time since last promotion (Section 1, item 6) and length of time in current posting (Section 1, item 9) were also insignificant statistically.

Comparison 2

Executive Branch vs Instructor Branch
(n = 154) (n = 20)

Section 1 of the Survey questionnaire

No statistically significant mean Scale or item score differentials were observed in this Section.

Section 2

Item 9 How satisfied are you with the quality of the RAN Personnel Management (including Officer Career Planning)?

Satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Most unsatisfied

Branch	Mean	t	p
Executive,	3.5		
Instructor	2.5	3.38	.002

As with Engineers, Instructor officers are significantly more dissatisfied with the management of their careers than are members of the Executive branch.

Section 3

Item 8 At present how certain do you feel that you could get satisfactory employment in civilian life without much trouble?

Branch	Mean	t	p
Executive	3.0		
Instructor	3.7	-4.4	.000

In common with Engineers, Instructors are significantly more sanguine concerning their civilian career prospects than are Executive branch officers. This result appears to reflect the "meal ticket" aspect of teaching degrees.

Section 4

Item 1 How well do you think the Navy is run.

Very well 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very badly

Branch	Mean	t	p
Executive	3.8		
Instructor	3.1	3.27	.002

The members of neither of these two branches appear to think that the Navy is run very efficiently. However Instructor officers are significantly more likely to have this negative opinion than are Executive officers.

Section 5. Resignation influences

No significant mean score differences were observed for items in this Section.

SUMMARY

In common with members of the Engineering branch, Instructor branch officers were more critical of Navy personnel management and general overall management than were Executive officers.

They also shared the Engineers' greater equanimity about future civilian job prospects when compared with the Executive branch.

COMMENT

It can be concluded that members of the Instructor branch in common with the members of the Engineering branch possess more critical attitudes towards some of the same aspects of the Navy than do members of the Executive branch. However the negative attitudes of Instructors are far less wide ranging than those of the Engineers.

CONCLUSIONS AND COMMENT

The premise, outlined above, that the possession of "tool" or "meal ticket" degrees might imply an occupational orientation to the Navy rather than an institutional one does not appear to be as fully validated by the above results from young Instructors (30 years) as it was in the case of young Engineers when the latter were compared to the attitudes of young Executive officers. Instructors were more critical only of general Navy management and Navy personnel management in particular, whereas mean Engineer attitudes exhibited a comparative host of significant differentials when compared to mean attitudes of Executive branch officers. On this basis the mean overall orientation of Instructors would appear to be closer to the institutional one purported to be characteristic of Executive officers than it would be to the occupationally oriented members of the Engineering branch. This assessment is tentative for the present.

In terms of sample characteristics, this subsample of Instructors was significantly older ($p = .000$) and a longer period had elapsed since their last promotion ($p = .000$) than was the case with the counterpart sub-sample of Executive branch officers.

Comparison 3

Executive Branch vs Supply Branch
(n = 154) (n = 42)

Apart from evidence that more of the wives of Supply branch officers were studying for degrees (Section 3, item 25) no mean Scale or questionnaire item score differentials of any significance appeared in this comparison.

SUMMARY AND COMMENT

In comparing mean attitudes of each of the three other branches in turn with those of the Executive branch in the above fashion the following tentative conclusions are possible.

- a. Engineers' attitudes least resemble those of Executive officers
- b. Mean Supply branch attitudes appear to differ least from those of the Executive branch.
- c. Mean Instructor branch officer attitudes also overlap considerably with those of Executive officers but they have two key mean differences from the Executives. Instructors are more critical of Navy management than Executives and they possess a significantly greater certainty of obtaining satisfactory civilian employment. These two mean differentials were also found with Engineering branch officers when compared to Executives.

This picture roughly coincides with that outlined in Salas (1989). The relevant Table is reproduced below. The top end of the Early Career stage roughly coincides with age 30 years.

Table 4

(from Salas, 1989)

Type Differences - A Summary

Early Career Stage

(Years 1 to 12)

Type A	Type B	Type C
Executive & Supply	Engineers	Instructors
Younger	Higher Acad quals	Higher Acad quals
Lower ranking	More dissatisfied with officer career planning	Less service time
More attracted to Mid-career education	More attracted to civilian career	Longer time since last promoted
More satisfied with Navy management	Believe Navy is badly run	More prone to be married
More satisfied with remuneration	Less concerned with Navy housing	More children 6 to 12 years of age
Less sure of civilian employment	Less satisfied with career prospects	Dissatisfaction with Dream Sheet
	See Navy as inefficient employer	Dissatisfied with promotion chances
	Less emotional commitment to Navy	Higher Family Factor Influence

The rough groupings of Executive and Supply branch officers in the above Table reflects that visible in the present results.

However, when the attitudes of young, tertiary educated Supply branch officers were compared with their age peers within the same branch who did not possess tertiary qualifications a marked occupational orientation was apparent amongst those with the higher educational qualifications (Salas, 1990). When the same analysis was performed within the Executive branch, no mean attitude differential resulted between tertiary qualified and non tertiary qualified branch members. (ibid).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It can be claimed that the present results suggest that young graduate Engineers are more occupationally oriented in their attitudes towards the Navy and less institutionally oriented and that young graduate members of the Executive branch are more institutionally oriented and less occupationally oriented when the mean attitude patterns of both of these branches are compared. The greater intrinsic institutional orientation of Executive branch officers is underlined by the results of the within-branch analysis (Salas, 1990).

Attitudes of tertiary educated members of the Instructor and Supply branches in this age group appear to possess extensive overlap with those of the members of the Executive branch according to the results of the present analysis. However two considerations should be kept in mind in this regard.

- a. Instructor officers in concert with Engineers are dissatisfied with the career management function. They also report greater prospective ease of finding civilian employment when compared with Executive officers. i.e. the Instructors like Engineers have a direct and specific civilian reference group.
- b. the within-branch analysis which showed that young, tertiary qualified Supply branch officers possess a more occupational orientation than did their branch and age counterparts who did not have a tertiary education (Salas, 1990). This result is supported by observation (see

Introduction). On these grounds it can be concluded that young graduate Engineering, Supply and to a lesser degree Instructor officers, in that order tend to be more occupationally oriented and less institutionally oriented than are Executive branch officers.

The hypothesis appears to be confirmed.

The Utility of the I/O Hypotheses

Likely attitude differentials between branches within any Service were forecast by the originator of the institutional occupational (I/O) attitudinal hypothesis (Moskos 1986) so that the results of the present analysis, particularly when they were explained by the present writer in terms of the differential civilian marketability of tertiary educational qualifications held by officers and which are characteristic of some of the branches under study here, (Engineers, Supply and Instructor) appear to fit the rationale of the I/O hypothesis quite neatly. Some may perceive the present results as supportive of the general trend of the argument especially as, to quote Moskos (ibid) "the occupational military model is anchored in marketplace principles".*

However the present writer is not all that comfortable with the general statement of the I/O hypothesis. For a start it seems an abstraction which has sprung fully formed from the brow of its originator in that it seems to lack not only specified antecedents but also survival consequences in particular. This open-endedness and lack of established foundational anchor points either of a societal, logical or psychological nature does not appear to offer much in the way of utility.

Ignoring the possible antecedents of the I/O position for the moment, what, if any, are the survival consequences for a country defended by an all-occupationally oriented military? On the other hand there have been witnessed some disturbing, not so remote examples of the consequences to society in general of the existence of highly institutionalized militaries. Which are the "good" and "bad" ingredients of the I/O model? As Segal observes "That one is concerned about pay, benefits and the economic well-being of one's family need not mean that one is a bad soldier" (1986 p. 363)

Another key aspect of the I/O hypothesis is the inexorable necessity firmly stated by Moskos (ibid) for institutional attitudes to become transformed into occupational ones. No career timeframe is specified for this. No

* See Technical Note 3

acceptable anchor point, period, state or career stage is suggested for the likely beginning of this process let alone demonstrated. No rate of change is specified and neither have any behavioural consequences to recent date. There is evidence that occupational orientation might increase overtime without any simultaneous diminution of institutional orientation. (Stahl et al, 1981).

In this the I/O hypothesis appears to run counter to available observational, anecdotal evidence from say, religious, civil service, large commercial, caring or penal institutions. This information suggests that the longer the duration of close contact the more "institutionalized" the individual member is likely to become. This effect can be distinguished in the military. e.g. Stahl, et al, showed that senior Air Force officers are more institutional and less occupational than are junior officers (1981).

Finally little evidence from the civilian population appears cited in support of the I/O hypothesis (Segal, 1986)* Civilian attitudinal baselines could shed some cautionary light on some of the items currently in use scaling I/O attitude orientation* and perhaps of the likely pervasiveness of the construct.

Heuristic Possibilities

1. The evidence presented in this and a previous publication (Salas, 1990) suggests that the (I/O) hypothesis might be usefully expressed in terms of the rising incidence of technological education. The usefulness of this expression lies in its susceptibility to comparatively straightforward measurement. Stahl et al (ibid) has already showed that holders of doctoral degrees were more occupational and less institutionally oriented than were Air Force personnel without degrees.#

* See Technical Note 1

However there was no control for age. Most of the degrees specified had clear-cut civilian referents.

2. Measuring the effects of duration of contact with the institution is another attractive path of inquiry. The present writer (1989) has traced Navy officer attitudes between and within branches across career stages along a 0 to 24 years continuum. Initial results suggest that negative volatility of attitudes towards the Navy appears to diminish with length of service. Confirmation is required of this.
3. Age, is worth further investigation in the present context. The attitudes within the RAN Executive and the Supply branches of those aged over 30 years appear less negative and volatile than are those possessed by younger officers (Salas *ibid*) The role of age is currently under further study by the present writer and results will be available soon.
4. The effects of occupational grouping and personality factors should not be overlooked in the search for anchor points for the I/O orientation. In the present studies Engineers appear to be possessed of the clearest occupational orientation of all four RAN branches studied. According to Holland (1973) members of this occupational grouping share a number of personality traits not so clearly evident among other groupings. He claims that Engineers belong to an occupational group which is drawn to practical, concrete, down-to-earth occupations. Members of this group tend to be comparatively unsentimental, less emotional and more objective and tend to be interested in things rather than people. On the other hand Instructors are representative of people oriented professions and Supply officers are preoccupied with data. Perhaps one of the antecedents of an occupational orientation may lie in personality and in occupational choice or a complex of both.
5. The implication of the possession of predominantly occupational attitudes towards the military could be sought in attrition, especially resignation rates. One might assume that resignation rates would be lower for the more dedicated, committed, institutional types. RAN officer resignation data since 1985 suggest that this assumption is supported so far as the Royal Australian Navy is concerned. Executive branch officers (= more institutional) have a historically

lower resignation rate than do the more occupationally oriented Engineer, Supply and Instructor branches.* However these results were not subject to control by educational status (tertiary vs secondary) so the attrition question remains an open one.

6. Organizational commitment (Mowday et al 1979) a quasi-sociological construct, must surely find a place in the further study of the I/O hypothesis. Once known as the psychological construct of identification, commitment appears likely in turn to have strong links to general satisfaction with Service life. The results of an unpublished factor analysis of 10 satisfaction scale items and 6 commitment scale items together saw most of the commitment items loading on the satisfaction dimension. All 16 items later formed a scale with a coefficient alpha of 0.91.#

Williams and Hazer (1986) have studied the relationship between job satisfaction (a component of the general satisfaction scale) and organizational commitment after a review had indicated that this linkage had previously been overlooked. The authors reported "a strong and important (reciprocal) relation" between satisfaction and commitment.

Navy satisfaction and commitment levels are higher amongst (institutional) Executives than amongst (occupational) Engineers in the RAN (Salas, 1989). Age and tenure are also positively associated with organizational commitment (Arnold and Feldman, 1982, Porter et al, 1974). This phenomenon has also been noticed locally. (Salas, 1990).

The present writer is already on record as speculating that an occupational orientation might be primarily a product of youth (Salas, ibid).

* See Technical Note 2

Retention Survey data

Technical Note 1

- a. One item from the six item Military Ethos Scale (Cotton, 1981) reads as follows

"What a member does in his private life should be no concern of his supervisor or commander"

One item from a pre-test pool of 127 administered to civilian and to soldier samples to identify attitudes which discriminated between the civilian and military respondents (Salas, 1965)* reads as follows

"My conduct outside of working hours is of no concern to any employer of mine."

The following results were found

	Army (n = 217)	Civilian (n = 140)	t	Level
Agree	33.1%	38.9%	1.5	N/S

There is a likelihood that other such convergencies of opinion between military and civilian samples are to be found. This would be of importance in the present discourse where the growth of occupational orientation in the military is equated with its growing civilianization.

- b. "Of course, no research has addressed the specific question of whether civilians are institutional or occupational". (Segal, 1986, p.364)

* Salas, R.G. A comparison of Civilian and Soldier attitudes towards the Australian Army. Research Report No.57 Australian Army Psychology Corps 1965.

Technical Note 2

RAN Officer Resignation Survey

Table 1

Item 6	Branch of Service							
	1988		1988		1985		1885	
	Resigners		Borne*		Resigners		Borne*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Seaman	76	39	1179	53	79	38	-	55
Engineering	45	23	427	19	56	27	-	20
Supply	13	7	283	13	24	12	-	12
Instructor	16	8	158	7	6	3	-	7
Other	28	15	174	8	10	5	-	6
Missing	15	8	-	-	31	15	-	-

Branches differ in size so a more meaningful measure of differential resignation rates is observable in the proportion of resigners# compared with the total in any branch. The latter is provided by the "Borne" statistics in Table 1 above. i.e. the resignation rate for Seaman officers (Executives) is $76/1179 = 6.4\%$ and so on. The following Table results

Table 2

Differential resignation rates by Branch

Branch	Rate
Engineering	10.5%
Instructor	10.1%
Executive	6.4%
Supply	4.6%

* From DNMP

ORQ return rate = 67%+

Table 1 extracted from

Salas, R.G. A Third Analysis of Officer Resignation from the Royal Australian Navy. DPSYCH-N Research Note 2/89. Area Psychologist, Melbourne, April 1989. (Page 4)

The percentage of resignations to those borne in 1988 is 10.5% for Engineers and 6.4% for Executive. This differential is in the expected direction but is probably insignificant statistically. These results have not been controlled for age or level of education.

* From DNMP

Technical Note 3

The effects of the marketability of officers' educational qualifications were already being speculated upon by the present writer in early 1985.

The following quote from material published then, in an exit setting, gives some guide to the writer's thinking at that time.

The data were extracted from an RAN Officer Resignation Questionnaire. (ORQ) survey.

"Type A

Subsample A would consist of members of 30 years of age or younger, single, tertiary educated and who may possess a positive assessment of their market value in civilian life associated with a desire to capitalize on this* possibly in a non Government environment #.

* 58% of the 26 to 30 age group cite attractions of a higher civilian pay as a resignation influence. This is the highest subscription of any age group by about 20%, to this influence.

Of those who cited a desire to try talents in civilian life as a resignation influence 90% were headed for self-employment and 80% were headed for private employment. Only 53% of those who cited this desire as a resignation influence were intending public employment."

Salas (1985, p.27)

Technical Note 4

Table 1

ANOVA

Young, degree holding, male officers.

Branch by Scales (in descending magnitude of F)

Scale	F	Sign
Job Estimation (JOBEST)	12.1	.000
Career Prospects (CP)	7.2	.000
Job Satisfaction (JOBSAT)	5.4	.001
Service Effectiveness (SE)	5.4	.001
Commitment (CS)	4.2	.006
Emotional Commitment (KS)	4.0	.008
Career Motivation (CMS)	3.4	.017
General Satisfaction (SQ)	2.9	.03
Remuneration Scale (RS)	2.5	.06
Resignation Propensity (RP)	1.9	.314
Family Factor (FF)	0.6	.59

COMMENT

Career Prospects (CP) and the estimation of readily obtaining civilian employment (JOBEST) are by far the most effective discriminators between branches. JOBEST scores have already been shown to be considerably lower amongst Executive branch members across career stages (Salas 1989). The above results are generally consistent with those reported in that Note (ibid) and in the present publication.

REFERENCES

1. Arnold, H.J., & Feldman, D.C. (1982). A multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 350-360.
2. Cotton, C.A. Institutional and Occupational Values in Canada's Army, Armed Forces in Society, Vol 8, 1, Fall 1981, 99-110.
3. Jans, N.A. Careers in Conflict. Canberra. Series in Administrative Studies No 10. Canberra College in Advanced Education 1988, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory.
4. Holland, J.L. Making Vocational Choices. A Theory of Careers, Prentice - Hall, N.J., 1973.
5. McNichols, C.W. and Manley, R.T., Journal of Political and Military Sociology 1981, Vol 9 (Spring): 43-47.
6. Moskos, C.C. Institutional/Occupational Trends in Armed Forces; An update. Armed Forces & Society, Vol 12, 3, Spring 1986, 377-382.
7. Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 14, 224-247
8. Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T., & Boulian, P.V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 603-609.
9. Salas, R.G. The Assimilation of Male Volunteer Recruits into the Australian Regular Army. A study of the militarization process. MA Thesis, University of Western Australia, 1967 (a).
10. Salas, R.G. Recruit Satisfaction with Navy Life. DPSYCH-N Research Note 2/84 Area Psychologist, Melbourne, 1984.

11. Salas, R.G. Officer resignation from the Royal Australian Navy. Analysis of a questionnaire survey. Area Psychologist, Melbourne. March 1985.
12. Salas, R.G. Measurement of Resignation Propensity. A Descriptive Analysis. Part 1. Scale Construction. Research Note 6/87. Issued by Area Psychologist, Department of Defence (Navy Office), Melbourne, Victoria. March 1988.
13. Salas, R.G., The Effects of Career Stage and Branch Membership upon the Attitudes of RAN Officers. Parts 1 and 11. DPSYCH-N Research Note 4/89, November 1989. Area Psychologist, Department of Defence (Navy Office), Melbourne, Victoria.
14. Salas, R.G. The Effects of Age, Educational Level & Branch Membership upon the Attitudes of Male RAN Officers. DPSYCH-N Research Note 1/90, January 1990. Area Psychologist, Department of Defence (Navy Office), Melbourne, Victoria.
13. Segal, D.R. Measuring the Institutional/Occupational Change Thesis. Armed Forces & Society, Vol 12,3, Spring 1986, 351-376.
16. Stahl, M.J. McNicholls, C.W. and Manley, R.T. An Empirical Examination of the Moskos Institution - Occupation Model. Armed Forces & Society, 6, Winter 1980, 257-269.
17. Williams, L.J. and Hazer, J.T. Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction and Commitment in Turnover Models. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1986, 71, 2, 219-231.

STAFF-IN-CONFIDENCE
(WHEN COMPLETED)

The information contained in this form will be used for statistical purposes only and the author's anonymity will be preserved. To answer the questions please colour in the circle next to the appropriate choice.

(e.g. If you are a male your answer to Question 3 would read -- 3. Sex: Male ☒ Female ☐)

If the question involves giving numbers, letters or dates please write the characters in the boxes above each column then colour the appropriate response position underneath. Some questions ask for written comments and submissions. Please write responses to these questions in the space provided on the last page (Section 6).
USE ONLY PENCIL TO MARK THE RESPONSE POSITIONS. RUB OUT ANY ERRORS AND REMARK

SECTION 1

1. Service Number :

6	8	5	3	6	6	6	6
7	6	1	6	1	1	1	1
6	3	2	2	6	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
5	3	5	6	6	6	6	5
7	3	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	3	3	3	8	8	8	3
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

2. Summary :

A 20x20 grid of 400 small, stylized, repeating patterns, likely a decorative border or a textured background. The patterns are arranged in a regular, repeating fashion across the entire grid.3. Sex : Male ☒Female: ☐

4. Date of Birth:

5. Date joined R.A.N.

DAY	MONTH	YR
	JAN	19
	FEB	
00	MAR	22
01	APR	11
02	MAY	22
03	JUN	33
04	JUL	44
05	AUG	55
06	SEP	66
07	OCT	77
08	NOV	88
09	DEC	99

DAY	MONTH	YR
	JAN	19-
	FEB	
0-2	MAR	0-2
1-1	APR	1-1
2-2	MAY	2-2
3-3	JUN	3-3
4	JUL	4-4
5	AUG	5-5
6	SEP	6-6
7	OCT	7-7
8	NOV	8-8
9	DEC	9-9

6. Time (yrs) since last promotion.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

7. Age now (yrs and months)

Years

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Months

S	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Length of continuous service (yrs)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

9. Length of time in current posting. (months)

0	16	8
12	24	30 +

10. Branch

Executive..... ☐

Engineer..... ☐

Supply..... ☐

Instructor..... ☐

Health Services..... ☐

Other..... ☐

11. List

GL..... ☐

SD..... ☐

SL..... ☐

SS..... ☐

RI..... ☐

Other..... ☐

12. Substantive Rank

SBLT..... ☐

LEUT..... ☐

LCDR..... ☐

CMDR..... ☐

CAPT..... ☐

13. On which list were you initially commissioned?

GL..... ☐

SL..... ☐

SD..... ☐

IT..... ☐

Other..... ☐

14. Current Job

Sea ☐ Shore ☐

15. Highest Academic Qualification

Secondary..... ☐

Tertiary..... ☐

16. Marital Status

Single..... ☐

Married..... ☐

Other..... ☐

17. Number and Age of Children

No children..... ☐

Children 0 - 5 yrs..... ☐

Children 6 - 12 yrs..... ☐

Children 13 - 18 yrs..... ☐

Children 19 + yrs..... ☐

18. Do you 'have' your own house?

Yes..... ☐

No..... ☐

If you answered 'No' do not complete Item 19.

19. Are you now living in your own house?

Yes..... ☐

No..... ☐

20. Have you ever lost money on house sales or purchases, house financing/refinancing including mortgage difficulties directly due to Service reasons?

Often..... ☐

Sometimes..... ☐

Never..... ☐

Not Applicable..... ☐

Posting and Course Preferences.

For the next three questions, indicate your first FIVE preferences by marking the appropriate number next to your choice. For example, if your first location preference is Jervis Bay mark the 1 next to it, but if it is your fifth preference then you would mark the 5 response position.

Please mark only 5 preferences in each question and for Question 21, please also indicate your Present Posting.

21. Location Preference.

Present Posting

Sydney Area..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Nowra..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Jervis Bay..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Canberra Area..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Melbourne Area..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Westernport..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Perth Area..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
North West Cape..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Adelaide Area..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5

Present Posting		
Brisbane.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Cairns.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Darwin Area.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Hobart.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Overseas.....	<input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5

22. Posting Preferences

Present posting	1 2 3 4 5	Officers Trng	1 2 3 4 5
Sailors Training	1 2 3 4 5	Exchange	1 2 3 4 5
Sea Going	1 2 3 4 5	Joint Staff	1 2 3 4 5
- Minor Unit	1 2 3 4 5	Trng Devel.	1 2 3 4 5
- Major Unit	1 2 3 4 5	Trng Qual	
Staff - Ops (Gen)	1 2 3 4 5	Control	1 2 3 4 5
Staff - Manpower	1 2 3 4 5	Staff - Ops	
Supply Mgt	1 2 3 4 5	(Intel)	1 2 3 4 5
CDSC/SWSC	1 2 3 4 5	Staff - Proj	
ILS	1 2 3 4 5	Mgt	1 2 3 4 5
UW Med	1 2 3 4 5	Flying	1 2 3 4 5
Est Med Staff	1 2 3 4 5	Per Fin Mgt	1 2 3 4 5
Fire Protection	1 2 3 4 5	Movement/Tpt	1 2 3 4 5
Recruiting	1 2 3 4 5	Hospital	1 2 3 4 5
Test Flying	1 2 3 4 5	Security	1 2 3 4 5
Dockyard	1 2 3 4 5	EDP	1 2 3 4 5
Cash Duties	1 2 3 4 5	Submarine	1 2 3 4 5
Secretarial	1 2 3 4 5	Flying Instructor	1 2 3 4 5
Stores	1 2 3 4 5	Overseeing	1 2 3 4 5

23. Courses Desired

Single Service		Joint Service Staff	1 2 3 4 5
Staff	1 2 3 4 5	Ships Diving	1 2 3 4 5
Language	1 2 3 4 5	Hydrography	1 2 3 4 5
MCD	1 2 3 4 5	Meteorology	1 2 3 4 5
Oceanography	1 2 3 4 5	PWO (C)	1 2 3 4 5
PWO (ASW)	1 2 3 4 5	PWO (G)	1 2 3 4 5
PWO (D)	1 2 3 4 5	APWO	1 2 3 4 5
PWO (N)	1 2 3 4 5	Submarine	1 2 3 4 5
AIC	1 2 3 4 5	Observer	1 2 3 4 5
Pilot	1 2 3 4 5	QHI	1 2 3 4 5
QFI	1 2 3 4 5	Post Graduate	1 2 3 4 5
Test Pilot	1 2 3 4 5	F/T Civ School	1 2 3 4 5
ILS	1 2 3 4 5	LEDC/Fit	1 2 3 4 5
Project Mgt	1 2 3 4 5	U W Med	1 2 3 4 5
EDP	1 2 3 4 5	RAF Aero	1 2 3 4 5
Joint Serv NBC	1 2 3 4 5	Systems	1 2 3 4 5
NAVIC	1 2 3 4 5	Trng - Admin	1 2 3 4 5
Trng -		Trng - Qual	
Anal/Design	1 2 3 4 5	Control	1 2 3 4 5

SECTION 2

1. Officers have expressed the observation that there are comparatively few billets at future rank levels which have much interest in them. This implies posting an officer to positions for which he/she is not a volunteer. How does, or will, this situation apply to you?

Very much ☐ 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 ☐ Not at all

Please write in Section 6 any feasible solutions you may have for the above problem.

2. An unofficial suggestion has been made that members be given access to whole or part of their long service money when it becomes due. Some thousands of dollars would be involved. What is your reaction to this idea?

Extremely favourable..... ☐
 Highly favourable..... ☐
 Favourable..... ☐
 Unsure..... ☐
 Not favourable..... ☐

3. How frequently are you frustrated at the lack of decision making opportunities (including the signing of correspondence, signals and documents) for one of your rank level?

Continually..... ☐
 Frequently..... ☐
 Sometimes..... ☐
 Never..... ☐

4. How are you attracted to the concept of Mid Career Management Education for those officers who not have a previous opportunity for obtaining degree qualifications?

Very strongly..... ☐
 Strongly..... ☐
 Mildly..... ☐
 Uncertain..... ☐
 Not attracted..... ☐
 Against it..... ☐

5. What is your estimation of the level of esteem in which the RAN is held by the civilian population at present?

Very high..... ☐
 High..... ☐
 Uncertain..... ☐
 Low..... ☐
 Very low..... ☐

7. Have you been properly trained for your present job?

Yes, fully ☐ Yes, partially ☐
 Not really trained ☐ Not applicable ☐

Reporting

8. How satisfied are you with the current RAN Officer Personal Reporting System?

Very satisfied ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Most unsatisfied

9. How satisfied are you with the quality of the RAN Personnel Management (including Officer Career Planning)?

Satisfied ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Most unsatisfied

10. How effective do you think is the dream sheet system?

Very effective ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Useless

SECTION 3

RESIGNATION

1. Have you ever considered resigning?

Yes.....○
No.....○

If you answered 'Yes', please specify in Section 6 when and for what reason you changed your mind on that/those occasion(s).

2. At present, how actively are you considering resignation?

Very actively ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Not considering it at all.

Note: The next three questions are to be only answered by those who answered ⑥, ⑦ or ⑤ to Question 2. Others please go to Question 6.

3. Please give an estimated time frame in which your contemplated resignation is most likely to be implemented.

0-2 mths ○ 3-6 mths ○ 7-12 mths ○
13-18 mths ○ 19-30 mths ○ 30+ mths ○

4. Is there any chance that your proposed resignation could be averted or deferred?

No chance.....○
Could be deferred.....○
Could be averted.....○
Not sure.....○

5. What action, within reason, do you consider that the Navy (DNOP) could take, in your case, to either avert or defer your proposed resignation? Please answer in Section 6.

6. Numbers of resigning officers express concern at what they describe as the erosion of benefits and conditions of service. Show the extent of your agreement with this assertion as a possible resignation factor in your case.

Very strongly agree ⑦⑥⑤④③②① Very strongly disagree.

Civilian Employment

7. Have you had one or more job offers from organizations or individuals outside the Service over the past 2 years?

No.....○
One.....○
2 or 3.....○

8. At present how certain do you feel that you could get satisfactory employment in civilian life without much trouble?

Very certain.....○
Fairly certain.....○
Uncertain.....○
Not Applicable.....○

9. Have you actively initiated enquiries about one or more employment prospects outside of the Service over the past two years?

No.....○
Yes, one.....○
Yes, 2 or 3.....○
Yes, more than 3.....○

If you answered Yes above, what triggered these off? (explain briefly in Section 6)

10. How many of these were related directly to your Navy employment?

N/A.....○
None.....○
One.....○
Some.....○
Most.....○
All.....○

11. How attractive does the idea of career employment in civilian life appear to you at present?

Very attractive Not sure Very unattractive
⑦⑥⑤④③②①

12. Would you leave the Service without a job to go to upon resignation?

Yes.....○
No.....○
Maybe.....○

13. What kind of civil employment would you prefer on discharge?

- Self employment..... ☐
Public Service..... ☐
Private enterprise..... ☐
Don't know..... ☐

14. Required income from any prospective civil job.

- Not applicable..... ☐
Less than 50% of current gross salary..... ☐
50%-90% of current gross salary..... ☐
90%-110% of current gross salary..... ☐
More than 110% of current gross salary..... ☐

15. How does your Navy pay (allowances, benefits etc.) compare with the money you think you could expect to receive in civilian life?

Much better ⑦ ⑥ ⑤ ④ ③ ② ① Much worse

Return of Service Obligation (ROSO)

To be completed by those officers currently serving under a ROSO

16. How long was the period of the ROSO which you incurred?

1yr ☐ 1 to 2 yrs ☐ More than 2 yrs ☐

17. From today, how long will it be before your ROSO terminates?

Less than 1yr ☐ 1 to 2 yrs ☐ More than 2 yrs ☐

18. What are your likely intentions following the termination of your ROSO?

- Resign..... ☐
Not sure..... ☐
Make a Navy career..... ☐

19. How committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career?

- Not committed at all..... ☐
Some commitment..... ☐
Very committed..... ☐

Spouse's Employment/Education

20. Does your spouse currently, or usually work at paid employment?

- Yes..... ☐
No..... ☐
Sometimes..... ☐
Not applicable..... ☐

If you answered Yes or Sometimes to the item above please answer Questions 21 and 22.

21. Would your spouse's employment be

- Full-time..... ☐
Part-time..... ☐
Home based..... ☐
Own business..... ☐
Other..... ☐

22. Mark any of the following statements which apply as reasons for your spouse being employed:

- to help maintain family living standards..... ☐
to help improve family living standards..... ☐
to fund specific activities or projects such as ☐
(mark as many as apply)

- children's education including their cultural and sporting pursuits..... ☐
spouse's own education/career efforts..... ☐
home buying activities..... ☐
car buying..... ☐
family vacation /leisure project..... ☐
to maintain previous skills..... ☐
post- Service family objectives..... ☐
other..... ☐
for something to do..... ☐
other..... ☐

23. Is your spouse enrolled in any study courses which require her/his attendance at lectures etc?

- Yes..... ☐
No..... ☐
Not applicable..... ☐

If so, please answer the following.

24. Is the study

- Full-time..... ☐
Part-time..... ☐

25. Level of study

- Tertiary academic..... ☐
TAFE certificate..... ☐
Secondary..... ☐
Other..... ☐

26. Have you ever been concerned that your children may be exposed, on occasion, to a variety of social/ideological beliefs held by their school teachers?

- Yes, often..... ☐
Occasionally..... ☐
Never..... ☐
Not applicable..... ☐

27. To what extent have you and/or your family been the victims of what is termed "crisis management"?

- Often..... ☐
Sometimes..... ☐
Never..... ☐
Not applicable..... ☐

28. If so, how traumatic has this been to all concerned?

- Very traumatic..... ☐
Upsetting..... ☐
Mildly upsetting..... ☐
Non traumatic..... ☐
Not applicable..... ☐

SECTION 4

Below is a list of questions on how you feel about the Navy. Read each statement and mark your answer by filling in the response that indicates how you feel one way or the other.

1. How well do you think the Navy is run?

Very well ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Very badly

2. What sort of chance does the Navy give you to show what you can do?

A very good chance ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ A very poor chance

3. In general, how do you feel about life in the Navy?

Very satisfied ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Very dissatisfied.

4. How do you feel about making the Navy your career?

Very keen to. ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Don't want to

5. How do you feel about your chances of promotion in the Navy?

Satisfied ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Dissatisfied.

6. Do you feel in general that you are doing better in the Navy than you could in civilian life?

Very much better ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Very much worse

7. Do you think you have improved and bettered yourself by being in the Navy?

Very much so ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Not at all

8. How satisfied are you with your Navy pay?

Very satisfied ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Very dissatisfied.

9. How do you feel with your current Navy job?

Very satisfied ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Very dissatisfied.

10. Men and women coming into the Navy expect things from their future Navy life. How well would you say that your expectations have been met?

Much better than expected ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Much worse than expected.

11. At present, how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career?

Very committed ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Not committed at all

12. How satisfied are you with your Navy career to date?

Very satisfied ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Very dissatisfied.

13. How satisfied are you that you chose to join the Navy over other careers available?

Very satisfied ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Very dissatisfied.

14. I find that my values and Navy values are very similar

Strongly agree ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Strongly disagree

15. Navy membership has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

Strongly agree ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Strongly disagree

16. How strong is your sense of obligation to the Navy?

Very strong ①②③④⑤⑥⑦ Non existent

SECTION 5

REASONS FOR RESIGNATION

Please examine the statements below and indicate by marking the appropriate response position, how much influence each of these factors might contribute to your decision to resign from the RAN.

(Note: Single Officers are to ignore items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.)

Key

- A. No influence on decision.
- B. Some influence on decision
- C. Moderate influence on decision
- D. Great influence on decision.
- E. Most influence on decision

	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
1. Effects of posting turbulence on spouse's education.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
2. Effects of posting turbulence on spouse's employment.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
3. Effects of posting turbulence on marital harmony.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
4. Effects of posting turbulence on children's education.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
(if applicable)					
5. Spouse's attitude to your RAN service.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
6. Desire to live in one location.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
7. Desire to obtain DFRDB benefits.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
8. Uncertainty about future policy on DFRDB benefits.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
9. Promotion expectations unlikely to be met.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
10. Unattractiveness of likely future posting locations or jobs.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
11. Non-use or misuse of your professional skills.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
12. Desire to try your talents in a civilian environment.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
13. Belief that you cannot achieve any further significant contribution to RAN.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
14. Frustration with efforts to achieve perceived RAN objectives within current defence organizational system.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
15. Attraction of higher income out of RAN.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
16. Dissatisfaction with RAN housing scheme.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
17. Financial costs of being in RAN (eg. removals).....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
18. The special problems associated with marriage to another Officer.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
<u>Female Officers only.</u>					
19. Pregnancy.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
20. Have offspring and can't mix child rearing with a Navy career.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
21. Consider amount of maternity leave is inadequate.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
22. Posting with spouse/partner is impossible.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
23. Restricted career options because of limitations placed on the employment of Service women.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
24. Frustrated with having to cope with traditional male Service attitude towards females.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
25. Have married or intend marrying a non-commissioned serviceman and am concerned about the Service's attitude to this.....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)

For All Officers

26. Any other reason (please specify).....	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
.....					
.....					

8. Length of continuous service (yrs)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19

9. Length of time in current posting. (months)

0 ☐ 16 ☐ 8 ☐
12 ☐ 24 ☐ 30 + ☐

10. Branch

Executive..... ☐
Engineer..... ☐
Supply..... ☐
Instructor..... ☐
Health Services..... ☐
Other..... ☐

11. List

GL..... ☐
SD..... ☐
SL..... ☐
SS..... ☐
RL..... ☐
Other..... ☐

12. Substantive Rank

SBLT..... ☐
LEUT..... ☐
LCDR..... ☐
CMDR..... ☐
CAPT..... ☐

13. On which list were you initially commissioned?

GL..... ☐
SL..... ☐
SD..... ☐
IT..... ☐
Other..... ☐

14. Current Job

Sea ☐ Shore ☐

15. Highest Academic Qualification

Secondary..... ☐
Tertiary..... ☐

16. Marital Status

Single..... ☐
Married..... ☐
Other..... ☐

17. Number and Age of Children

No children..... ☐
Children 0 - 5 yrs..... ☐
Children 6 - 12 yrs..... ☐
Children 13 - 18 yrs..... ☐
Children 19 + yrs..... ☐

18. Do you 'have' your own house?

Yes..... ☐
No..... ☐

If you answered 'No' do not complete Item 19.

19. Are you now living in your own house?

Yes..... ☐
No..... ☐

20. Have you ever lost money on house sales or purchases, house financing/refinancing including mortgage difficulties directly due to Service reasons?

Often..... ☐
Sometimes..... ☐
Never..... ☐
Not Applicable..... ☐

Posting and Course Preferences.

For the next three questions, indicate your first FIVE preferences by marking the appropriate number next to your choice. For example, if your first location preference is Jervis Bay mark the 1 next to it, but if it is your fifth preference then you would mark the 5 response position.

Please mark only 5 preferences in each question and for Question 21, please also indicate your Present Posting.

21. Location Preference.

Present Posting

Sydney Area..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Nowra..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Jervis Bay..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Canberra Area..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Melbourne Area..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Westernport..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Perth Area..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
North West Cape..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5
Adelaide Area..... <input type="radio"/>	1 2 3 4 5

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SCALES

CAREER MOTIVATION

As noted above, the Career Motivation Scale (CMS) measures the extent of the desire to continue serving.

The scale is comprised of the following items from the Retention Survey Questionnaire. The Section and item numbers follow in parentheses.

1. At present how actively are you considering resignation? (S3Q2)
2. Please give an estimated time-frame in which your contemplated resignation is most likely to be implemented. (S3Q3)
3. At present, how certain do you feel that you could get satisfactory employment in civilian life without much trouble? (S3Q8)
4. Have you actively initiated enquiries about one or more employment prospects outside the Service over the past 2 years? (S3Q9)
5. How many of these enquiries were related to your Navy employment? (S3Q10)

N.B. For this scale, the items were keyed so that a high score indicated a low level of motivation to continue serving and vice-versa. This should be remembered when interpreting Tabled data

The CMS proved to be unifactorial with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.71. This is a satisfactory result and one which could probably be improved upon. All items were generated by the present writer.

NAVY COMMITMENT SCALE

The following six items were included in the Retention Survey Questionnaire with the aim of measuring officer commitment to a Naval career.

Commitment Scale items (Section 4)

	Item
At present, how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career?	(11)
How satisfied are you with your Navy career to date?	(12)
How satisfied are you that you chose to join the Navy over the other careers available?	(13)
I find that my values and Navy values are very similar	(14)
Navy membership has a great deal of personal meaning for me	(15)
How strong is your sense of obligation to the Navy?	(16)
This scale is unifactorial with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of .84	

The above instrument was constructed to test the role of organizational commitment amongst RAN officers. A description of the construct is covered in Mowday et al (1982). Broadly speaking, it describes the proclivity possessed by a member of an organization by which he identifies with it to the extent that he views the goals and aims of the organization as HIS goals and aims, its values as HIS values and, figuratively speaking, its existence as HIS existence. Associated with these feelings are a desire to continue to maintain contact with the organization and to repudiate membership of other organizations.

The first three items were generated by the present writer. The "careers available" item was designed to substantiate the choice for a Navy career over alternatives. The "career to date" item establishes a direct link between the satisfaction and the commitment constructs.

The "values" item is modified from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCL; Mowday et al, 1982). The "personal meaning" item was designed to allow for the expression of broader emotional feelings, (affective commitment) whilst the "obligation" item gives expression to the feeling that one "ought" to remain serving as a duty, out of allegiance or loyalty.

The Affective Commitment (K) Scale comprises the following items from the Retention Questionnaire.

Section & item

1. How do you feel about making the Navy your career? (S4Q4)
2. I find that my values and Navy values are very similar. (S4Q14)
3. Navy membership has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
(S4Q15)
4. How strong is your sense of obligation to the Navy? (S4Q16)

The K. Scale which purports to isolate the emotional component of commitment is unifactorial and has a reliability coefficient (alpha) of .81.

COMMITMENT - IDENTIFICATION - SATISFACTION

Organizational commitment is a construct which seems co-dimensional with another, older one, that of identification with the organization. In fact, in Mowday et al. (ibid.) the two terms are sometimes used interchangeably.

In a Defence Force with its characteristic all-embracing responsibility for most significant aspects of a member's life and welfare the concept of individual commitment (or identification) seems especially pertinent when evaluating retention/turnover/attrition and attempts at predicting these. This supposition appears strengthened by contemplating, for one, the longer training and more intense indoctrination period characteristic of military employment conditions compared with those conditions of employment in most civilian organizations.

Identification (commitment) has been shown to be associated with assimilation to the Army (Salas, 1967) and assimilation status has in turn been significantly linked to retention over a three-year term.*

In the model used in the study, (ibid) the thesis that a certain prior level of satisfaction with other-rank Army life was a prerequisite of attaining a measure of identification (commitment) with the organization was supported.

In the present study of Navy officer retention, both the satisfaction and commitment (identification) constructs were found to be very highly significantly correlated from a moderate to high degree.

Three SQ items are found in the 9 item Resignation Propensity (RP) scale. The RP Scale, the conceptual reverse of the Career Motivation scale, has been found to be a valid predictor of RAN male, officer resignation activity. (Salas, 1988b).

THE SATISFACTION SCALE QUESTIONNAIRE (SQ)

A ten-item adaptation of a 14 item scale of satisfaction with Army life (Salas, 1967b) was included in the Retention survey.

* unpublished follow-up study of results in Salas (1967).

The SQ is a well documented scale, the results of which have been shown to be implicated in the separation and the re-engagement decisions of other - rank personnel. (Salas, 1984).

The SQ items used in the Retention Study are listed below:

1. How well do you think the Navy is run?
Very well 7 6 5 4 3 3 2 1 Very badly
2. What sort of chance does the Navy give you to show what you can do?
A very good chance 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 A very poor chance
3. In general, how do you feel about life in the Navy?
Very satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very dissatisfied
4. How do you feel about making the Navy your career?
Very keen to 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Don't want to
5. How do you feel about your chances of promotion in the Navy?
Satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Dissatisfied
6. Do you feel in general that you are doing better in the Navy than you could in civilian life?
Very much better 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very much worse
7. Do you think you have improved and bettered yourself by being in the Navy?
Very much so 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all
8. How satisfied are you with your Navy pay?
Very satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very dissatisfied
9. How do you feel with your current Navy job?
Very satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very dissatisfied

10. Men and women coming into the Navy expect things from their future Navy life. How well would you say that your expectations have been met?

Much better than expected 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Much worse than expected

The present version of the SQ does not cover the possible universe of content. Satisfaction with supervision is one important omission. Intention to re-engage, a potent item in reflecting general satisfaction in the other rank version of the SQ, was excluded as being inappropriate in the officer setting.

Items 1, 2 and 3 ("In general, how do you feel about life in the Service?"), has a history. This item first saw the light of day in Australia as part of the Satisfaction Scale Questionnaire (Salas, 1967). It originally appeared in "The American Soldier" (Stauffer et al, 1949) as part of a Guttman scale of satisfaction with Army life.

The SQ has 2 factors with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of .82. With item 8 (pay) removed the SQ becomes unifactorial.

OTHER SCALES

The most important of these in the present context would be the Resignation Propensity (RP) Scale and the SQ, a measure of satisfaction with Navy life in the Retention Survey.

* Stouffer, S.A., Suchman, E.A., De Vinney, L.C., Star, S.A. and Williams, R.M. The American Soldier Voll Adjustment during Army Life: Princeton, N.J. Princeton Univer. Press, 1949.

The Resignation Propensity Scale (RP)

This is described at length in Salas (1988a, b). It is a nine item measure, scores on which provide an index of an officer's tendency towards voluntary separation from the Navy.

R P. Scale

Instruction: You are invited to answer some or all of the questions below, if you wish.

1. How do you feel about your chances of promotion in the Navy?
Satisfied 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Dissatisfied
2. Do you feel in general that you are doing better in the Navy than you could in civilian life?
Very much better 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very much worse
3. How do you feel about making the Navy your career?
Very keen to 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Don't want to
4. At present, how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy Career?
Very committed 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not committed at all
5. How attractive does the idea of career employment in civilian life appear to you at present?
Very attractive 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very unattractive
6. Have you had one or more job offers from organizations or individuals outside the Service over the past 2 years?
No.....1
Yes, one.....2
Yes, 2 or 3.....3
Yes, more than 3....4

8. Have you ever considered resigning?

Yes1

No2

9. If you answered Yes to the above item 8, please give an estimated time frame in which your contemplated resigning is most likely to be implemented.

0-2 mths1 3-6 mths2 7-12 mths3

13-184 19-30 mths5 30 + mths6

Not Applicable....7

Three factors were identified in the RP Scale. It has a reliability coefficient (alpha) of .72.

The Job Satisfaction Scale (JOBSAT)

This measure comprised the following items, all from Section 4 of the Retention Survey Questionnaire.

What sort of chance does the Navy give you to show what you can do?
(S4 item 2)

In general, how do you feel about life in the Navy? (S4 item 3;
This item also appears in Jans' Career Motivation Scale).

How do you feel about your current Navy Job? (S4 item 9).

At present, how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career?
(Commitment Scale, CS) (S4, item 11)

How satisfied are you with your Navy career to date?
(Commitment Scale, CS) (S4, item 13)

The JOBSAT Scale is unifactorial with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.79.

The Service Effectiveness (SE) Scale.

This measures attitudes towards the efficiency of the Navy as an employer. It includes opinions about career management,.

SE scale items are as follows: (The origin of each item is given in parentheses.)

How well do you think the Navy is run? (S4 item 1)

What sort of chance does the Navy give you to show what you can do? (S4 item 2)

In general, how satisfied do you feel with Navy life? (S4 item 3)

How satisfied are you with the current RAN Officer Personal Reporting System? (Section 2, item 8)

How satisfied are you with the quality of RAN Personnel management (including officer Career Planning)? (Section 2, item 9)

How effective do you think is the dream sheet system? (Section 2, item 10)

The SE Scale is unifactorial with a reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.79.

The Remuneration Scale (RS)

This instrument scales attitudes towards service and civilian pay and the financial costs of being a member of the Navy. The RS is made up of the following items. Origins of items are given in parentheses.

How satisfied are you with your Navy Pay? (S4 item 8)

How does your Navy pay (+ allowances, benefits etc) compare with the money you think you could expect to receive in civilian life? (Section 3, item 15).

Financial costs of being in RAN (e.g. removals) - (as a resignation influence; Section 5, item 17)

The R. Scale is unifactorial and has a reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.65.

The Career Prospects Scale (CP)

This device measures officers' attitudes towards their future Naval career. The scale is made up of the following items from the Retention Survey questionnaire.

1. Officers have expressed the observation that there are comparatively few billets at future rank levels which have much interest in them. This implies posting an officer to positions for which he/she is not a volunteer. How does, or will, this situation apply to you?
2. How satisfied are you with the quality of the RAN personnel management (including officer Career Planning?) (Section 2, item 9)
3. How do you feel about your chances of promotion in the Navy? (Section 4, item 5)
4. At present how committed do you feel to the idea of a Navy career? (Section 4, item 11)
5. Unattractiveness of likely future posting locations or job (as a resignation influence) (Section 5, item 10)

This scale proved to be bi-factorial with a coefficient (alpha) of 0.62.

Note

The Career Prospects Scale was excluded from earlier analyses when it was discovered that item 5 from Section 4 of the questionnaire (promotion chances) had been omitted from it.

Promotion prospects are integral to the assessment of future career prospects, at some stages perhaps more than at others. (three of the nine items used by Jans (1988) in his career prospects scale alluded to "promotion".)

JOBEST

This consists of one item which scales an officer's perception of the degree of availability to him of civilian employment. It reads as follows.

"At present how certain do you feel that you could get satisfactory employment in civilian life without much trouble?" (Section 3, item 8)